



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

:	COMMISSIONER FOR FATER
	P.O. Box 1450
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
	www.uento.gov

APPLICĂTION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/590,831	06/09/2000	Ronald H. Sartore	0325.00369	1466	
21363	7590 01/08/2004		EXAM	INER	
CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C		P.C.	PERVEEN, REHANA		
24025 GREAT SUITE 200	ER MACK		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ST. CLAIR SHORES, MI 48080		2182	11		
		•	DATE MAILED: 01/08/2004	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

~,					0.			
		Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)	X			
*	•		,831	SARTORE ET AL.	U			
	Office Action Summary	Examir	ner	Art Unit				
		Rehana	a Perveen	2182				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	tion appears on	the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence addres	is			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA naions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. FOR 1.136(a). In no cation. ays, a reply within the sory period will apply and, by statute, cause the a	event, however, may a statutory minimum of thi d will expire SIX (6) MO application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commu BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>24 November</u>	<u>r 2003</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)	☑ This action is	non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application. ✓ 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-15 is/are rejected. ✓ Claim(s) 6-9 and 16-19 is/are objected to. ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 							
	ion Papers	in director didentition	rroquiromoni.					
	•							
-	The specification is objected to by the E The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 June 2000</u> is		nted or h\□ obj	ected to by the Evaminer				
. • , 🚨	Applicant may not request that any objection	-	•					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including th			, ,	.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner.	Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-1	52.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
* \$ 13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internationa See the attached detailed Office action facknowledgment is made of a claim for cince a specific reference was included in 7 CFR 1.78. 1) The translation of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for efference was included in the first sentence for the foreign language.	cuments have be cuments have be the priority docuing large au (PCT Roman list of the condition of the first sentent age provisional domestic priority	een received. een received in a ments have been Rule 17.2(a)). ertified copies no under 35 U.S.C ace of the specific application has b under 35 U.S.C	Application No In received in this National Staget received. It is \$ 119(e) (to a provisional application or in an Application Datable on the process of the process	olication) a Sheet. pecific			
Attachmen								
2) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pape			Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152				

Art Unit: 2182

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-9 and 16-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vercesi, Patent No. 4,007,449.

As to claims 1 and 10, Vercesi teaches a peripheral device connected to a host device, wherein a speed of the peripheral device is adjusted in response to one or more predetermined conditions (abstract and col. 12 line 56 – col. 13 line 6).

Art Unit: 2182

As to claim 2, Vercesi teaches the peripheral device is further configured to electrically disconnect and reconnect at the adjusted speed to the host device (abstract).

As to claim 3, Vercesi teaches the electrical disconnection/reconnection comprises re-enumeration of the peripheral device (abstract).

Claims 11-13 are directed to the method of system claims 1-3 and 10. Vercesi teaches the system as set forth in claims 1-3 and 10. Therefore, Vercesi also teach the method as set forth in claims 11-13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vercesi as applied to claims 1-3 and 10-13 above

As to claim 4, it is noted that Vercesi does not expressly teach the peripheral device being a USB device. However, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the speed adjustment technique to a

Art Unit: 2182

number of different types of devices (Vercesi, col. 1 lines 14-44) including a USB device since such technique would have enabled the prior art USB devices to run at optimal speeds.

Claim 14 is directed to the method of system claim 4. Vercesi teaches the system as set forth in claim 4. Therefore, Vercesi also teach the method as set forth in claim 14.

Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vercesi as applied to claims 1-3 and 10-13 above, and further in view of Dischler et al, Patent No. 6,311,287.

As to claim 5, Vercesi teaches one or more predetermined conditions comprise one or more speed considerations (abstract and col. 12 line 56 – col. 13 line 6). However, Vercesi does not expressly teach the one or more predetermined conditions comprise one or more power considerations. Dischler et al clearly teach a device adjusting its speed based on one or more predetermined conditions comprising one or more power considerations (abstract and col. 2 lines 18-38).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Vercesi and Dischler et al because both are commonly directed to device speed adjustment techniques, and Dischler et al's power

Art Unit: 2182

considerations in addition to the speed considerations, when incorporated into Vercesi's

system, would have enabled improved system efficiency.

Claim 15 is directed to the method of system claim 5. Vercesi and Dischler et al.

in combination, teach the system as set forth in claim 5. Therefore, Vercesi and

Dischler et al, in combination, also teach the method as set forth in claim 15.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Rehana Perveen whose telephone number is 703-305-

8476. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jeffrey C Gaffin can be reached on 703-308-3301. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

Rehana Perveen

Primary Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2182

Page 5